### 

®JS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

#### CIVIL COVER SHEET

APPENDIX H

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating

the civil docket sheet. (SEE I)	STRUCTIONS ON THE REVE	RSE OF THE FORM.)	•			at court for the purpose of militar	
I. (a) PLAINTIFF TAMARA SMITH		INC	DEFENDANTS MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC. and GREG MORRIS, ESQ. and PATENAUDE & FELIX, A.P.C.				
	of First Listed Plaintiff Phile EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF C			J. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.			
			Cour	nty of Residence of	of First Listed Defendant <u>L</u> (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASE		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Cary L. Flitter, Esq. and Theodore E. Lorenz, Esq., Lundy, Flitter, Beldecos & Berger, P.C., 450 N. Narberth Avenue, Narberth, PA 19072, (610) 822-0770						USE THE LOCATION OF THE	
II. BASIS OF JURISD	PICTION (Place an "X" in C	me Box Only)	III. CITIZEN	SHIP OF PE	RINCIPAL PARTIE	S(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
□1 U.S. Government	<b>FT</b> • <b>D</b> • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	***************************************	(For D	iversity Cases Only)	1	and One Box for Defendant)	
U.S. Government Plaintiff		Not a Party)	PTF Citizen of Thi	s State	DEF  Incorporated or of Business In 1		
U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	p of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of And	other State	2 Incorporated a n	d Principal Place 5 5 5 5	
			Citizen or Sub Foreign C	_	3 Sporeign Nation		
IV. NATURE OF SUIT							
☐ 110 insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	ORÍS PERSONAL INJUR	FORFEITUR  v		BANKRUPTCY  422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability	☐ 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice ☐ 365 Personal Injury -	620 Other 625 Drug F	Food & Drug telated Seizure erty 21 USC 881	☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce	
& Enforcement of Judgment  151 Medicare Act  152 Recovery of Defaulted		Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	630 Liauor 640 R.R. & 650 Airline 660 Occup	Truck Regs.	PROPERTY RIGHTS  ■ 820 Copyrights  ■ 830 Patent  ■ 840 Trademark	□ 460 Deportation     □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)  153 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product	PERSONAL PROPERTY  ☐ 370 Other fraud ☐ 371 Truth in Lending	Y Safety/I- ☐ 690 Other		SOCIAL SECURITY	490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service	
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract	350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage ☐ 385 Property Damage	☐ 710 Fair La Act ☐ 720 Labor/l	bor Standards Mgmt. Relations	□ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)	850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410	
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise  REAL PROPERTY	360 Other Personal Injury CIVIL RIGHTS	Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS	☐ 730 Labor/I & Disclo ☐ 740 Railwa	Mgmt.Reporting sure Act	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations	☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: ☐ 530 General		abor Litigation Ret. Inc.	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	892 Economic Stabilization Act   893 Environmental Matters   894 Energy Allocation Act   895 Freedom of Information   Act	
245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	☐ 535 Death Penalty ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition	Printer at the contract of the	THE PARTY OF THE P		☐ 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice ☐ 950 Constitutionality of	
	Other  440 Other Civil Rights	Production of the Control of the Con				State Statutes	
V. ORIGIN  (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  Transferred from  Original Proceeding  (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  Transferred from  4 Reinstated or Reopened (specify)  Appeal to District  7 Judge from Magistrate Judgment							
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute 15 U.S.C. § 1692 Brief description of cause		ng (Do not cite j	urisdictional stat	tutes unless diversity):	en e	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	CLASS ACTION	DEMAND S	-	HECK YES only if demandury DEMAND: X Yes	ded in complaint	
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY DATE	(See instructions):	JUDGE			CKET NUMBER	Principle and solid in a state in the contract of the principle in the contract of the contrac	
1/24/07	•	SIGNATURE OF ATTOR	KNEY OF RECOR	IJ			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY							
RECEIPT # AM	OUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUD	GE	

APPENDIX I

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

# CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM TAMARA SMITH : CIVIL ACTION V. : MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, : INC. and GREG MORRIS, ESQ. and : NO. PATENAUDE & FELIX, A.P.C. :

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a case management track designation form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

#### SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

610-668 Telepho (Civ.660)	one Fax Number E-Mail Address			
Date	Attorney at Law Attorney for			
1/2	1107 7. Ind PLAINTIFF			
(f)	Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks. (		)	
(e)	Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases)		)	
( · )	exposure to asbestos.			
(d)	Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from			
(c)	Arbitration - Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. (	X	)	
(b)	Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits (		)	
(a)	Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. §2241 through §2255.		)	

#### 

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

APPENDIX F

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION I assignment to appropriate calendar.	FORM to be used by cou	nsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of					
Address of Plaintiff: 1740 Georges Lane, 1st Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19131							
Address of Defendant: _8875 Aero Drive, San Diego, CA 92123 and 213 East Main Street., Carnegie, PA 15106							
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: 1740 Georges Lane, 1st Floor, Philadelp	(Use Reverse Side For Additional Space)						
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporate two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.C.	poration and any publicly l liv.P. 7.1(a)	neld corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?  Yes □ No ☑					
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?		Yes No 🛛					
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:							
Case Number: Judge_	Date Terminated:						
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following quest	ions:						
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending o	r within one year previou	sly terminated action in this court?					
Yes No 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?  Yes No Yes No							
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit o	r any earlier numbered ca	se pending or within one year previously					
terminated action in this court?		Yes No No					
	2. Airplane P 3. Assault, D 4. Marine Per 5. Motor Veh 6. Other Pers 7. Products L 8. Products L 9. All other C (Please spe	Contract and Other Contracts resonal Injury refamation resonal Injury ricle Personal Injury ronal Injury (Please specify) riability riability (Asbestos) riversity Cases rify)					
☐ Relief other than monetary damages is sought	,						
DATE:Attorney-at-Law		Attorney I.D.					
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury on	erminer Americk (Art 200 st.) bestärels, bestärels standert konseler och socialisete (millisete) und sing der						
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pass noted above.  DATE:/24/57	eending or within one ye	ear previously terminated action in this court except  67795 Attorney I.D.					

clf\smith-midland\pleadings\complaint smith- midland/patenaude

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

NO.

TAMARA SMITH

CIVIL ACTION

1740 Georges Lane, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Philadelphia, PA 19131

Plaintiff

VS.

MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC. 8875 Aero Drive

San Diego, CA 92123

AND

GREG MORRIS, ESQUIRE 213 East Main Street Carnegie, PA 15106

**AND** 

PATENAUDE & FELIX, A.P.C. 213 East Main Street Carnegie, PA 15106

Defendants

#### **COMPLAINT**

#### I. INTRODUCTION

- 1. This is an action for damages brought by a consumer pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §1692 ("FDCPA").
- 2. The FDCPA prohibits debt collectors from engaging in deceptive and unfair practices in the collection of a consumer debt.
  - 3. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute.

#### II. JURISDICTION

4. Jurisdiction arises under 15 U.S.C. §1692k and 28 U.S.C. §1337.

#### III. PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff is Tamara Smith, a consumer who resides in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania at the address captioned.
- 6. Defendant Midland Credit Management, Inc. is a foreign corporation with a mailing address as captioned (herein referred to as "Midland").
- 7. Defendant Patenaude & Felix, A.P.C. (herein referred to as "Patenaude") is a Pennsylvania debt collection law firm with offices for the regular transaction of business at the address captioned.
- 8. Defendant Gregg Morris, Esq., (hereinafter "Morris") is an attorney for Patenaude.
  - 9. Midland, Morris, and Patenaude, are collectively referred to as "defendants".
- 10. Each defendant regularly engages in the collection of consumer debts by use of the mails and telephone.
- 11. Each defendant regularly attempts to collect consumer debts alleged to be due another.
- 12. Each defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is contemplated in the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. §1692a(6).

#### IV. STATEMENT OF CLAIM

13. On May 24, 2006, Smith filed suit against Patenaude in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania for violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA"), 15 U.S.C. §1692. That suit is styled as *Tamara Smith v. Patenaude & Felix*,

- A.P.C., Civil Action No. 06-CV-2203(ER).<sup>1</sup> At all times relevant hereto, Morris represented Patenaude in that action.
- 14. Two weeks later, on June 7, 2006 and with no payment demand, Morris and Patenaude, obstensibly on behalf of Midland, filed a state court complaint against plaintiff on two accounts alleged due, including the account on which Patenaude sent the collection letter in question in the federal action. The state court action is styled as *Midland Credit Management Corp. v. Tamara Smith*, Phila. C.C.P. June Term 2006, No. 875. ("Collection suit")
- 15. Upon information and belief, the state court complaint was filed in retaliation for Ms. Smith asserting her rights under the FDCPA in the federal court case.
- 16. In the collection suit, Ms. Smith filed an Answer disputing and denying the accounts alleged due.
- 17. Ms. Smith served discovery requests, including a notice to take the deposition of Midland, in the collection suit.
- 18. On December 14, 2006, defendants moved before the Court of Common Pleas for a protective order to avoid having Midland appear for its deposition. The law firm of Maurice & Needleman appeared on behalf of the defendants.
- 19. On December 14, 2006, after extensive oral argument, the state court denied the motion for a protective order and directed Midland to appear at Smith's counsel's office within 10 days for its deposition. A copy of the State Court Order is appended as Exhibit "A".
- 20. Midland's deposition was noticed for December 22, 2006 at Smith's counsel's office. Midland failed and refused to show up.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Morris and Patenaude filed a motion to dismiss the complaint. That motion – after oral argument - was denied by the Honorable Eduardo C. Robreno on December 18, 2006. (Doc No. 12).

- 21. Defendant Morris, ostensibly on behalf of Patenaude & Midland, wrote to Smith's counsel on December 20, 2006 and December 21, 2006 (Exhibits "B & C" hereto)
- 22. Defendants, instead of appearing for the court ordered deposition of Midland, filed a discontinuance without prejudice, of the state court action.
- 23. Defendants discontinued without prejudice the state court action to side-step its court ordered deposition, but yet left open the option of re-filing the complaint against plaintiff.
- 24. Morris' letters dated December 20, 2006 and December 21, 2006 make clear defendants intention to re-file the state court case against Ms. Smith at some future time while side-stepping its court ordered deposition.
- 25. Defendants' collection conduct is harassing, abusive, deceptive, and unfair, in violation of the FDCPA.
- 26. Section 1692d of the FDCPA prohibits a debt collector from engaging in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt.
- 27. Section 1692e of the FDCPA prohibits a debt collector from using false, deceptive, or misleading means in an attempt to collect an alleged debt.
- 28. Section 1692f of the FDCPA prohibits a debt collector from using unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect a debt.
- 29. The defendants have engaged in harassing, abusive, deceptive, and unfair conduct in their attempt to collect the accounts alleged due by plaintiff.
- 30. The state court complaint was filed against Ms. Smith in retaliation for a prior federal suit commenced against Patenaude.

- 31. The defendants had no intention of litigating the state court action and Midland did not direct it. It was filed simply to harass and abuse Ms. Smith for filing the federal suit as evidenced by defendants' conduct in the state case.
- 32. Defendants sidestepped the state court discovery order by discontinuing the suit without prejudice, but have threatened to re-file the action and start anew. See Exhibits B and C hereto.
- 33. As a result of defendants conduct, plaintiff has been subjected to defendants' harassing and abusive conduct and has incurred costs and expense in defending against the state court action.

## COUNT I - FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT (V. MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC.)

- 34. Plaintiff repeats the allegations contained above as if the same were here set forth at length.
- 35. The conduct of Midland Credit Management, Inc. violated the FDCPA in the following ways:
- (a) by engaging in conduct the nature consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse plaintiff in connection with a collection of a debt alleged due, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692d.
- (b) by engaging in false, deceptive, or misleading conduct in the connection with the collection of any debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692e and §1692e(10).
- (c) by using unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect a debt alleged due, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692f.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Tamara Smith demands judgment against defendant for:

(a) Damages;

- (b) Attorney's fees and costs; and
- (c) Such other and further relief as the Court shall deem just and proper.

## COUNT II - FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT (V. GREG MORRIS, ESQUIRE)

- 36. Plaintiff repeats the allegations contained above as if the same were here set forth at length.
  - 37. Greg Morris' conduct violated the FDCPA in the following ways:
- (a) by engaging in conduct the nature consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse plaintiff in connection with a collection of a debt alleged due, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692d.
- (b) by engaging in false, deceptive, or misleading conduct in the connection with the collection of any debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692e and §1692e(10).
- (c) by using unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect a debt alleged due, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692f.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Tamara Smith demands judgment against defendant for:

- (a) Damages;
- (b) Attorney's fees and costs; and
- (c) Such other and further relief as the Court shall deem just and proper.

## COUNT III - FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT (V. PATENAUDE & FELIX, A.P.C.)

- 38. Plaintiff repeats the allegations contained above as if the same were here set forth at length.
  - 39. Patenaude & Felix's conduct violated the FDCPA in the following ways:
    - (a) by engaging in conduct the nature consequence of which is to harass,

oppress, or abuse plaintiff in connection with a collection of a debt alleged due, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692d.

- (b) by engaging in false, deceptive, or misleading conduct in the connection with the collection of any debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692e and §1692e(10).
- (c) by using unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect a debt alleged due, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1692f.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Tamara Smith demands judgment against defendant for:

- (a) Damages;
- (b) Attorney's fees and costs; and
- (c) Such other and further relief as the Court shall deem just and proper.

#### V. <u>DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL</u>

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury as to all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted:

Date: 01/23/07

/s/ Theodore E. Lorenz (TEL5114)
CARY L. FLITTER
THEODORE E. LORENZ
Attorneys for Plaintiff

LUNDY, FLITTER, BELDECOS & BERGER, P.C. 450 N. Narberth Avenue Narberth, PA 19072 (610) 668-0011